

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the present amendment, claims 13-25, 27-30, 32-37, and 48-55 remain in this application. Claims 20 is canceled in the present application and Applicant amends claims 13, 20, 21, 28, 29, 33, 34, and 37 in the present application to more clearly and particularly describe the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Objections

Claims 20 and 52 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being improper dependent from for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 52 has been canceled and claim 20 has been amended. It is disclosed in the specification (Page 10, last paragraph) that “[t]he television signal will typically be in one of the three major formats, i.e., NTSC, PAL, or SECAM...” Because video signal comprises component video signal and composite video signal and NTSC, PAL, or SECAM are component video signals, Applicant has amended claim 20 to “component video signal” to further limit the subject matter and respectfully submits that the amendment traverses the objection and no new matter is added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 13-25, 27-30, 32-37, and 48-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick *et al.* (US 6,314,479), hereinafter “Frederick”, in view of Auld *et al.* (US 7,316,013), hereinafter “Auld”, and Roskowski *et al.* (US 5,257,348), hereinafter “Roskowski”. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Rejection to Claims 13, 29, and 34

Claims 13, 29, and 34 have been amended to further distinguish the differences between the cited references and claims. The amendment is based on the original specification filed Feb. 25th, 2005 and Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added. In those claims, user input is received to change the mode of operation from said first mode of operation to said second mode of operation *through a series of interactive prompts* (Based on Spec. Page 11, Lines 28-29). Also, Page 10, the second and the third paragraph in the specification disclose that the display data channel conforms to a bidirectional DDC standard, which uses pins on the very same connector so that no additional connector is needed. Applicant respectfully submits that these two features disclosed in Claims 13, 29, and 34 are not taught by any of the cited references.

Specifically, the specification of the present invention discloses that “the user input may be obtained through a series of interactive prompts, such as a *software wizard* or the like to *guide* a user through the process of setting the display mode and optionally in making other settings.” Though Frederick provides the USB Class Definition for Human Interface Devices (HID) specification (Col. 10, Line 15-46 in Frederick), the HID are *hardware* devices, such as the USB interface mentioned in Frederick, and are used for transportation of user input from the display back to the user. On the other hand, the interactive prompts in Claims 13, 29, and 34, such as a wizard, are *software* for interactively communicating with the user. Besides, Auld merely discloses that “the video encoder provides input to a TV set and/or a video cassette recorder” (Col. 4, Line 19-22 in Auld) and further the Office Action stated that “...to modify Frederick’s system to utilize a display that is capable of being switched between interlaced and progressive scanning mode based on *the content to be viewed by a user*” (Page 5, first paragraph in the Office Action), showing that the combination of Frederick and Auld does not teach the

interactive behavior. Moreover, Roskowski is silent about the interactive behavior of the user interface. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the interactive prompts are not taught by any of the cited references and this feature clearly distinguishes Claims 13, 29, and 34 from the cited references, either individually or in combination.

Rejection to Claims 14-28, 30-33, 35-37, 41, 43, 45, 48-49 and 51-55

Claims 14-28, 30-33, 35-37, 41, 43, 45, 48-49 and 51-55 depend from claims 13, 29, and 34, and claim 33 and 37 are amended to further distinguish the difference between cited references and claim 33 and 37. Applicant respectfully submits the traverse of this rejection regarding to the patentability of the independent claims 13, 29, and 34.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ACER-45264.

Dated: February 4, 2010

By: /Michael A. Shimokaji/
Michael A. Shimokaji, Reg. No. 32303

SHIMOKAJI & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
8911 Research Drive
Irvine, CA 92618
(949) 788-9961